

Remarks:

§112 Rejections

Claim 59 is rejected under §112 as indefinite. The limitation: “said amine-terminated polyether resins” is deleted from claim 59, as set forth herein, and the rejection is therefore overcome.

§102 Rejections

Claims 9-11, 14, 16-22 and 32-33 stand rejected as anticipated by Dehm et al. Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite: “wherein at least about 70 percent of the active hydrogen groups in the reaction mixture are in the form of amine groups.” This limitation is similar to the limitations found, for example, in allowed claims 63, 64, 65 and 68, and Dehm does not teach a formulation having at least about 70 percent of the active hydrogens in the form of amine hydrogens. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to claim 9 and the claims dependent thereto is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejections

Claims 12-13 are rejected as unpatentable over Dehm et al. in view of Coyner et al. In light of the amendment to claim 9, discussed above, the rejection is overcome in that neither Dehm nor Coyner teaches the limitation of at least about 70 percent of the active hydrogens in the form of amine hydrogens.

Claims 1-7, 24, 27, and 30-31 stand rejected as unpatentable over Dehm et al. in view of Tabor et al. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the second component is a blend “including an amine-terminated polyether polyol having a molecular weight of at

least about 1500." None of the cited references teaches or suggests reacting a high-molecular weight aminated polyol with an isocyanate, as in claim 1, and the rejection is therefore overcome. This distinction is noted in the Examiner's discussion of Allowable Subject Matter.

Claims 23 and 28-29 are rejected as unpatentable over Dehm et al. in view of Oertel. Claims 23 and 28-29 depend from claim 9, now amended as set forth above, and the rejections are therefore overcome for reasons similar to those expressed with regard to claim 9.

Claim 8 stands rejected as unpatentable over Dehm in view of Tabor and Oertel. In light of the amendments to claim 1, from which claim 8 depends, the rejection is overcome. None of Dehm, Tabor or Oertel teach the use of high molecular weight amine-terminated polyether polyols.

Applicant has also submitted new claims 69, 70 and 71. Claims 69 is similar to previously submitted claims, however, Applicant has limited the claim such that the second component is a blend of primary and secondary amine-terminated polyols. This limitation reflects the amine-terminated polyol blend noted by the Examiner to be novel and unobvious over the prior art. Claims 70 and 71 depend from claim 69 and are allowable, *inter alia*, for similar reasons to those expressed with regard to claim 69.

Applicant respectfully acknowledges the allowance of claims 50, 53-56, and 60-68. All the remaining claims have been amended to overcome the rejections, allowance and passage of the subject application to issue is therefore respectfully requested. If Applicant may provide any further information, or assist the Examiner in the prosecution

of this application in any way, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (248) 364-2100.

Respectfully submitted,

DINNIN & DUNN, P.C.

By: M. T. Raggio
Michael T. Raggio (Reg. No. 36,645)
2701 Cambridge Court, Ste. 500
Auburn Hills, MI 48326
(248) 364-2100

Attorney for Applicant

Dated: May 19, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or deposited) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail (EV 383551302 US) in an envelope addressed to: Hon. Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By: C. M. Raggio